



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/816,611      | 04/02/2004  | Terry William Balko  | 62,381A             | 9814             |

25212 7590 04/12/2005

DOW AGROSCIENCES LLC  
9330 ZIONSVILLE RD  
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46268

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,611

Applicant(s)

BALKO ET AL.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152..

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1616

**Non-Final Office Action**

Acknowledgement is made of the response filed on 1/14/2005. Claims 1-6 are pending.

No claim is allowed.

Presently claimed invention is drawn to 4-aminopicolinates compounds and composition of formula (I), useful as herbicides.

Applicant's arguments and declaration filed by Paul R. Schmitzer was found persuasive therefore all the rejections made in our previous action over FIELDS et al (US Patent No. 6297197) are withdrawn.

Examiner thanks Applicants for providing an English translation of Belgium Patent 788756. In the last action Applicant was requested to send a clean copy of Belgium reference cited in IDS (BA). Examiner was unable to read due to poor print out.

The rejection is being made over this reference as follows.

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belgium Patent No. 788,756. The reference teaches substituted 4-amino-3,5-dihalo-6-alkylpicolinic acid derivatives which embraces Applicant's claimed invention. See the entire document especially formula I on page 1, examples especially example 2, line 6 on page 13 and claims.
3. Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming a subject matter, which is the selection of the prior art substituents. Instant claims are considered obvious when in prior art Q represents carboxylic acid COOH or COOR' where R' is alkyl; R represents alkyl group; X

Art Unit: 1616

represent chlorine or fluorine and Y represents alkyl group. As is clear that all the substituents are taught by the reference.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to prepare additional beneficial compounds useful as herbicides by selecting any halogen (in instant case Cl at 3-position and F at 5-position (X), One ordinary skilled in the art would expect the same properties for these compounds as taught by the prior art. Since prior teaches Cl or Br at 3 and 5-position the selection of any halogen would have been prima facie obvious to one skilled in the art.

See the compounds of claim 4, 5 and 6 which are 4-amino-3,5-dichloro-6-methyl picolinic acid (claim 4) are 4-amino-3,5-dibromo-6-methyl picolinic acid (claim 5) and are 4-amino-3,5-dichloro-6-ethyl picolinic acid (claim 6), all are taught by the prior art.

Furthermore, Examiner notes, that in Applicant's declaration compounds of the present invention A1 and A3 differ from this reference in having H at 5-position. These compounds are not taught by this reference. See the definition of X which is not H.

Instant claims differ from the reference in that they are of different generic scope. It had been held by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of "some" from among "many" is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner, 156 USPQ 163.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare compounds embraced by the genus of the above cited references with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds. The instant claimed compounds would have been suggested to one skilled in the art.

Art Unit: 1616

The substituents as presently claimed are taught by the prior art. For Applicant's convenience structures are drawn to easy comparison.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Accordingly, the burden of proof is upon applicants to show that instantly claimed subject matter is different and unobvious over those taught by prior art. See *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685, 688; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 and *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 293.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on (571) 272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Friday, April 1, 2005**